

REMARKS

Claim 4 has been amended so as to include features of prior claims 7 and 10, and then revised for increased clarity. Basis for any changes are also found in the drawing and its description. On further consideration, the preferred embodiment which includes the vehicle lock and window pane drive mechanism being interconnected has been separated into dependent claims. Conforming changes have been made to the other claims.

Claims 4, 7-11 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Sponable in view of the German patent to Hopper. Also, claims 19 and 20 were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Sponable in view Hopper and Manuel. Both of these rejections are respectfully traversed.

The present invention relates to a power window device for raising and lowering the window which is fitted on the lock of the motor vehicle door. The assembly comprises a vehicle door including an inner panel having a opposed vertical disposed edges, a vehicle lock, a window pane, a pair of pulleys, a window pane drive mechanism which moves the window pane between positions and window pane guide mechanism which is a pair of rails disposed on opposite edges of the inner panel to guide the window pane as it is moved by the window drive mechanism. The window pane drive mechanism consists of a motor, the pulleys, a drive cable which extends from a driver and traverses only two pulleys, the cable being fixed to the window pane

between the pulleys and optionally, a gear assembly, and is interconnected to the vehicle lock. The claimed assembly is not suggested by the prior art.

The Sponable reference relates to a window regulator which includes a scissors linkage including crossed lever arms connected at a pivot axis. That is very different from the construction of the present invention which is intended to eliminate the vertical guide rail found in conventional roller cable power window devices (exemplified by Staser, of record) and fix the guide pulleys directly to the inner panel of the vehicle, as shown in the drawing.

The German patent to Hopper does not cure the basic deficiencies in Sponable. It has been cited only to show a lock assembly interconnected to a drive mechanism. It is respectfully submitted not to be obvious to a person skilled in the art how to provide the Sponable scissor assembly interconnected with the lock assembly taught by Hopper, and even if it was, the resulting construction would be completely different from that now claimed. Moreover, there is also no motivation apparent to make the combination proposed in the Office Action.

The Manuel reference has been cited to show springs. As such, it does not serve to cure the basic deficiencies in the rest of the combination. Moreover, there is nothing in either Sponable or Hopper to suggest tensioning is needed or desired. Still further, the very complicated arrangement in Manuel which includes springs would

introduce a level of complexity into the combination which is directly contrary to the simplicity sought in the claimed invention.

In light of the foregoing differences, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn and all pending claims are in condition to be allowed. Accordingly, the early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Dated: November 17, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Edward A. Meilman
Edward A. Meilman

Registration No.: 24,735
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant